

JPRS: 2916

25 JUNE 1960

TRANSLATIONS FROM THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PERIODICAL
KUO-CHI WEN-T'I YEN-CHIU (STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS)

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

19990709 076 MAIN FILE

19990709 076

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

Photocopies of this report may be purchased from:
PHOTODUPLICATION SERVICE
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
WASHINGTON 25, D.C.

U.S. JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE
205 EAST 42nd STREET, SUITE 300
NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

JPRS: 2916

CSO: 4072-N

TRANSLATIONS FROM THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PERIODICAL
KUO-CHI WEN-Y'I YEN-CHIU (STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Article

Expose American Imperialists' Peace Pretensions	1
American Imperialism Is The Supporter of German Militarism	14
Criticism of Capitalist International Law In Regard To Theories On State Sovereignty	25

EXPOSE AMERICAN IMPERIALISTS' PEACE PRETENSIONS

[The following is a full translation of an article written by Mei Hao-shih appearing in Kuo-chi Wen-t'i Yen-chiu, No 3, 3 Mar 60, Peiping, pp 1-8.]

When history enters upon the 60's of the 20th century, a promising situation is unfolding before the people all over the world favorable for their struggle in quest of peace. As a result of the repeated struggle between the imperialist force of war on the one hand and the forces of socialism, national revolution and peace on the other, the international situation is relaxed to a certain extent. Even the ferocious, deadly American imperialists begin to chant tunes of peace. At the outset of his State of the Union message read to Congress in early 1960, U.S. President Eisenhower declared that "he was and still is determined to make the U.S. a stronger and stronger power dedicated to peace," hoping people to believe that the U.S. "is earnest in seeking a peace with assurance." While on his good will mission to eleven nations in 1959, Eisenhower mentioned particularly that "the U.S. is exerting great efforts in seeking peace," that it is willing to use conferences rather than force to settle international disputes," that "it is determined to follow a policy which will lighten people's burden due to armament," and that "the highest hope of the U.S. is to establish a world order in which all nations can fearlessly enjoy prosperity in freedom, justice and peace." At the same time, the U.S. Government also made some gestures showing its willingness to negotiate. What does all this mean? We must make a careful study.

I

Does the U.S. really want peace? An old Chinese adage says: "One judges a person by listening to his words and watching his deeds." If we take a close look at America's recent deeds, our answer can only be in the negative. The platitudinous talks about peace by American imperialists can never cover up their intensified arms expansion and war preparations.

The U.S. has not only not ceased arms expansion and war preparations, but has, as a matter of fact, accelerated her armament program centered around missile developments. Although America's financial situation is worsening day by day, the ruling bloc is still keeping military appropriations at a peak level. Eisenhower in

his budget message delivered to U.S. Congress in early 1960 asked for an appropriation of US\$40.6 billion for the defense department in fiscal year 1961, the annual defense outlay being about US\$41 billion. Taking in other appropriations used directly for military purposes, such as military "aid" to foreign countries, atomic energy plan, stockpiling of war material, etc., the total appropriation for so-called "national security" alone calls for US\$45.5 billion, representing 57.1 percent of the total budget. If all appropriations indirectly related to military purposes are included, the figure will occupy an even higher percentage in the total budget.

Special emphasis is put on the development of long-range guided missiles in America's new armament program. Eisenhower proposed that the fund for purchasing guided missiles in fiscal year 1961 be increased by US\$581 million to a total of US\$3,825 million. In addition, he proposed to use US\$3.9 billion for the research, development and testing of new weapons, with guided missiles topping the list. Closely related to the missile program appropriation is an appropriation for space development, amounting to US\$540 million, almost double the amount for fiscal year 1960. Eisenhower admitted that America's missile development has already reached a point where additional appropriations will no longer increase its speed. During the five years from 1959 to 1963, the U.S. armed forces will be re-equipped with new weapons of the missile age.

The U.S. has not stopped organizing aggressive blocs and intensifying war preparation activities despite her clamoring for peace. She is particularly grooming West Germany and Japan as her war allies. In arming West Germany, the U.S. is providing her with nuclear weapons and guided missiles. In deference to America's demand, West Germany is implementing its arms expansion plan. In 1963, she will have 12 division of troops as compared with nine at present. The U.S. also infiltrates West Germany with a large amount of capital to help the latter develop its armament industry for manufacturing fighter planes, short-range guided missiles, electronic equipment, small war vessels, tanks, etc.

In January 1960, the U.S. signed a military alliance treaty with Japan, enabling the U.S. army to use Japan as a base to take military action in areas north of the Philippines, including the coastal areas of the Chinese mainland and the maritime provinces of the Soviet Union. It also enables the Japanese to fight outside of their country in the name of "pursuing the enemy." With the

U.S.-Japanese treaty as a foundation, the U.S. attempts to create a new military bloc consisting of South Korea, the Chiang Kai-shek clique in Taiwan, the Philippines and South Vietnam. With the assistance of the U.S., Japan's military strength is now close to that on the eve of the Mukden incident. Japan is planning to raise its total value of ammunition production by 150 percent within the next six years, with special emphasis placed on the production of guided missiles and supersonic jets. The criminal act of the U.S. in aiding West German and Japanese militarism has seriously threatened the socialist states and endangered peace and security in Asia, Europe and the whole world.

Aside from assisting West Germany and Japan, the U.S. is strengthening every link of a long defense arc surrounding the socialist states stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific. In 1954, the North Atlantic bloc decided to establish by 1961 a minimum of 31 ground divisions in Central Europe. Now that there are only less than 21 divisions in existence, the U.S. is urging the NATO members to accomplish the goal as soon as they can. Meanwhile, the U.S. is losing no time in establishing intermediate-range missile bases in England, Italy and Turkey. At present, the U.S. has already set up 30 guided missile battalions in Europe, and hopes to increase to 100 battalions in 1963. At a North Atlantic Council meeting held in Paris in December 1959, the U.S. proposed a "ten-year plan" to give NATO nations not only an overwhelming power in a big-scale nuclear war but also high mobility in local wars.

Under the domination of the U.S., the CENTO council met in Washington, D.C. in October 1959, and decided to set up a permanent military representatives' group which is to become the nucleus of a "joint headquarters." Each member nation is to contribute a part of its troops to form a joint force which will be put under the training and command of the "joint headquarters." The meeting also decided to increase strategic military installations in the territory of CENTO nations. Even now, the U.S. is still anxiously persuading other nations to join the CENTO.

Furthermore, the U.S. is also preparing to organize a "joint army" for the SEATO nations. In conjunction with England and France, the U.S. builds airfields, harbors, highways, communications networks, radar networks and other military installations in Southeast Asian nations. The U.S. even compels Pakistan to move its capital in order to make Karachi a U.S. naval base in the Indian

Ocean. Negotiations are underway with Thailand and Pakistan to lease their territory as bases for America's intermediate-range missiles. In an attempt to expand the SEATO, the U.S. is secretly urging Pakistan to conclude a "defense alliance" with India.

To buy off these countries as America's mercenaries, Eisenhower proposed to increase military "aid." The proposed foreign "aid" appropriation for 1961 was set at US\$4.175 billion, or US\$949 million more than the last fiscal year. Among the foreign "aid," "military aid" amounts to US\$2 billion, or (US\$700 million more than that for last year,) representing an increase by 40 to 48 percent.

America's active war preparations along such a long defense perimeter from the Atlantic to the Pacific are evidently directed at the Soviet Union, China and other socialist countries and their people. This is entirely in contrast with America's platitudes about peace.

While expanding armament and stepping up war preparations, the U.S. continues to manufacture international tensions and provoke war everywhere in the world. She not only occupies our territory of Taiwan but also intrudes into our air space and territorial waters with her aircraft and naval vessels to provoke war with our country. Continuing to occupy South Korea without any intention to leave, the U.S. occupation force illegally moves missiles into South Korea. Supporting the reactionary forces in Laos, the U.S. flagrantly violates the Geneva agreement and stirs up civil war in that country. Frequent military maneuvers are held in Southeast Asia. According to the testimonies of Secretary of U.S. Army Wilber M. Brucker and Chief of Staff General Lyman Lemnitzer made public by the U.S. House Appropriations committee on 8 February, the U.S. has already drawn up a detailed plan for war in Southeast Asia.

The U.S. also attempts to use force to intervene the revolution in Cuba, and that country has been subjected to bombardment by U.S. airplanes. On 5 Feb. 1960, U.S. Marines landed at Dominica in an attempt to obstruct the anti-dictatorship struggle by the Dominican people. Incessant military maneuvers are held by the U.S. in the Caribbean Sea to intimidate Latin-American countries.

America's frantic war preparation activities are evident enough for everyone to see and responsible U.S. Government officials have made no effort to deny them. Following Comrade Khrushchev's visit to the U.S., the U.S. Secretary of Defense Neil McElroy repeatedly shouted that "the threat today is as serious as before" and that the U.S.

should not lower its vigilance because of U.S.-Soviet negotiations. U.S. Secretary of State Christian Herter made two speeches in November 1959, stressing that "relaxation of world situation should not be mixed with relaxation of our efforts;" otherwise, there will be "a fatal danger." Eisenhower put it even more bluntly in his State of the Union message and his budget message, saying that "as a country, only if we start from a broad base of strength can we successfully achieve our goal." He asked the Americans to contribute every ounce of their effort to forge "a real strength" which will be adequate to meet all situations ranging from "a limited emergent incident to an all-out nuclear war."

However, the peaceful pronouncements and gestures made by American Government leaders cannot cover up America's arms expansion, war preparations and her war policy. On many significant international issues, the U.S. although talking loudly about peace, actually adopts tactics of obstruction and procrastination. Not a single word was mentioned in Eisenhower's State of the Union message about the German peace treaty, the question of Western Berlin, U.S. occupation of Taiwan, and America's attitude toward an East-West summit conference. The U.S. Government announced instead that the U.S. would resume nuclear tests at any time. It is clear, therefore, the U.S. is only masquerading as a peace-loving country while she is actually engaged in war preparations. Indeed, she is playing the double-faced game of "preparing for war under pretensions for peace." It is dangerous not to know this intrigue.

II

Why should the U.S. play this game? And what is her objective?

In the present world today, socialism is growing stronger, other national democratic movement is rising vigorously and the world peace movement is spreading far and wide, while America's "position-of-strength" policy and "brink-of-war" policy have suffered one setback after another, and the U.S. is situated in a more and more disadvantageous position, politically, militarily and economically. In the face of a situation where the East wind prevails over the West wind, the U.S. can no longer rely upon her old methods. She has to play some new tricks.

Nowadays war or peace is the fundamental issue in world politics, and is the foremost question in the minds

of the people, who are anxious to have peace and abolish war. To settle international disputes equitably and rationally through negotiation is the persistent policy of all socialist states as well as the unanimous desire of all the people of the world. Since the Soviet Union and China have waged resolute struggles in defense of peace and in opposition to aggressive war, they have won great prestige and popularity. In view of the popularity of the ideal of seeking peace, the U.S. has no other alternative but to make peaceful gestures to fool the people. Lenin once said: "The capitalist class, because of its anti-proletariat and anti-revolutionary interests, is now making speculations about peace." (See "Complete Works of Lenin," Chinese version, Vol. VIII, p. 204.) Platitudes about peace by the American ruling bloc are exactly what Lenin called "speculations."

American imperialists' trick about peace has been going on for some time. As early as 1957, Eisenhower said at the NATO council that "there lies before the free countries a clear possibility of winning the victory by peaceful means because a noble strategy for triumph is now in existence." On 16 Jan. 1958, Dulles noted "a turning point" in the struggle between the socialist and capitalist camps, asserting that "if we do things like a bull in the arena, lowering its head and charging blindly toward the matador's red cloak, we may meet with destruction." In that talk, Dulles expounded specifically on what he called "the noble strategy to win victory." Following the Camp David talks between Khrushchev and Eisenhower, a spate of peace pronouncements came out from Washington which aroused international debates as to America's true intentions. However, it can be discerned clearly that America's clamoring for peace and reluctant display of peaceful gesture began only after the Moscow conference of the representatives from all Communist and Workers' parties throughout the world, and the successful launching of the Sputnik--the two events that signaled the prevalence of East wind over West wind. The change in America's foreign policy strategy is, therefore, by no means incidental.

First of all, America's scheme is aimed at buying time to retrieve its lost superiority in military power, and to catch up with the Soviet Union in missile production. In the realm of science and armament technology, the U.S. lags far behind the Soviet Union. The former chief of staff of the U.S. Army General Maxwell Taylor recently pointed up the low military value of American bombers and the limited power and lack of accuracy of

long-range missiles launched from fixed and exposed bases. According to the estimate of American scientists, the U.S. is three to five years behind the Soviet Union in missile development. This gap has caused a great alarm to the ruling bloc in the U.S. Keith Glennan, director of the U.S. National Astronautics and Space Administration, said that "the U.S. cannot talk about world leadership as a second power in outer space development." In order to continue its policy of war and aggression, the U.S. resorts to the trick of actively preparing for war while masquerading for peace for the purpose of gaining time to catch up with the Soviet Union in military technology and to retrieve its military superiority.

Secondly, the U.S. intends to paralyze people's will of struggle. America's unscrupulous war preparation activities and frantic arms expansion have already met with more and more vigorous opposition from the people all over the world. The mass struggle for peace and against war is gaining in strength and stature. Before he set out for his 11-nation tour in 1959, Eisenhower admitted at a press conference that many people were skeptical about America's sincerity in seeking peace. Therefore, the U.S. put on a mask on its face and makes gestures of peace in an attempt to disarm people in their thinking and catch everybody by surprise when it launches a war of aggression. This is a very shrewd and dangerous strategy.

Thirdly, the U.S. attempts to dissolve the socialist camp, to alienate China from the Soviet Union, and even wishfully hopes for a "peaceful evolution" in socialist states. The socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union is the strongest bulwark in defending peace and opposing war of aggression, and the greatest obstacle to America's aggressive ambitions. As the Sino-Soviet alliance is the nucleus of the socialist camp, the U.S. resorts to all sorts of tactics to break up the friendly relationship between socialist states, especially the solidarity between China and the Soviet Union. Recently, America's activities along this line have been greatly intensified, vainly hoping for a "peaceful evolution" in socialist states. Dulles once said: "Basically, we wish to encourage an internal evolution inside the Soviet camp so that it will no longer be a threat to freedom, mind its own business and refrain from carrying out its objective and ambition of communizing the world." In other words, the U.S. is attempting to achieve its ambition of restoring capitalism in socialist states by overthrowing, corrupting, subverting, infiltrating, splitting and dissolving the socialist camp in addition

to the method of outright aggressive war. This is not any different from the dream of a fool.

Fourthly, the U.S. attempts to use its false peace intentions to enslave the vast number of people in neutral countries where the national democratic movement is gaining momentum and America's new colonial policy is meeting with mounting opposition. Therefore, the U.S. has to play some new tricks in order to continue its aggression and enslavement in these areas. That the socialist camp lends its resolute support to the national democratic movement in neutral countries and that the influence of the socialist camp is getting stronger and stronger in those countries have been causes of alarm to the American imperialists. Vice President Nixon once said: "The people in Africa, Asia, Middle and Near East have a decisive role to play in the struggle between freedom and Communism." While using such cliches as "the menace of international Communism" and "the aggression and expansion of Chinese Communists," to keep the neutral countries away from the socialist camp, the U.S. puts on the mask of "peace" and "goodwill" to woo the neutral nations as a measure to undermine the solidarity of the forces of peace and anti-imperialism.

In addition, the U.S. is also attempting to use this tactics to allay the American people's increasing dissatisfaction toward the Eisenhower administration so that the Republican party may get more votes in this year's presidential election. Evidently, the U.S. also contemplates to use this tactic to readjust her relationship with the NATO nations, to reduce the ever-increasing contradiction in the alliance and to consolidate her so-called "leadership."

The American ruling bloc interprets these intrigues and designs as "a noble strategy for victory." In fact, this serves to show that the U.S. is getting weaker and weaker, her situation is getting more and more difficult, and she has to play the trick of preparing for war while pretending to seek peace as a desperate struggle before death. The U.S. ruling bloc's wishful thinking of retrieving its military superiority, paralyzing people's fighting morale, dissolving the socialist camp, enslaving neutral countries and undermining the nationalist democratic movement is bound to turn out to be merely dreams.

The American imperialists wave the flag of peace with one hand and prepares war with the other, with special emphasis on missile production. In other words, the U.S. is earnest in war preparations, and insincere in

singing the tune of peace. Her song of peace is sung for the interest of war preparations. Therefore the U.S. is sometimes tough and sometimes soft; softness is used only to prepare herself to be tough at some other time. The fundamental objective of U.S. foreign policy, namely, the elimination of socialism and world conquest, remains unchanged. On the eve of his death, John Foster Dulles recommended a book, "What We Must Know About Communism," to Eisenhower. In Chapter 17, the book says: "Henceforth, there may be less quarrels between the East and the West, but the basic situation in which each wishes to annihilate the other will not be changed." These words reveal clearly that the U.S. imperialists want to eliminate us all the time. This is the primary ambition of the American ruling bloc.

III

Aggression, aggrandizement and war policy are pre-determined by the nature of imperialism, Lenin pointed out that imperialism is a form of parasitic, rotten and dying capitalism and that war is the inevitable product of capitalism. The Moscow Declaration issued in November 1957 by the Communist party and Workers' party of socialist countries said: "So long as imperialism exists, there will be soil from where aggressive war will start."

Imperialism cannot survive without exploitation at home and abroad; nor can it survive without war, arms expansion and war preparations. We should never harbor the illusion that the policy of the imperialists may change into one of peace. In his article, "Abandon Illusions; Prepare for Struggle," Comrade Mao Tse-tung said: "When we say 'imperialism is very ferocious,' we say that its nature cannot be changed. Neither will the imperialists put down their butcher's knife, nor will they become Buddha until their death."

American imperialism, which has all the characteristics of imperialism, thrives on sucking the blood of American people and the people all over the world. Especially since the end of World War II, America's annexation and exploitation of other countries have reached an astonishing extent. Through foreign "aid," private capital export, unequal value exchange, control and exploitation of other capitalist countries and economically underdeveloped areas, the U.S. has established a big, strong financial empire. According to statistics, America's so-called foreign "aid" farmed out for the purpose of achieving her aggressive purposes amounted to

US\$84.6 billion. Private investments abroad by U.S. citizens almost doubled during the period from 1946 to 1958. Foreign interests under U.S. control are estimated at US\$47 billion. While U.S. monopoly capital is undergoing expansion all over the world, it is impossible for the U.S. not to adopt an aggressive and war policy.

The parasitic nature of American imperialism is becoming more and more pronounced. As a consequence, its policy of war and aggression is strengthened rather than weakened. During the last two years, America's economic position in the world was weakened as a consequence of the worsening of the general crisis of capitalism and the keen competition among the imperialists. This situation only makes U.S. monopoly capital more frantically look for outward expansion. After the establishment of the Common Market in Western Europe, private capital investments from the U.S. flowed in large quantities to Common Market nations, jockeying for a favorable competitive position. Lately the U.S. proposed to establish a Pan-American Common Market, which will include the Common Market in Western Europe, the Free Trade Area, and the U.S.-Canadian economic community with a view to putting the economy of both Europe and America under direct U.S. control. For increasing their exports, the U.S. monopoly capitalists compel other capitalist nations to relax restrictions on the importation of American goods. The U.S. Government announces that henceforth loans obtained from the U.S. Development Loan Fund should, in principle, be used to purchase American goods. Such aggressive policy will not only not resolve difficulties but also give rise to more and even worse contradictions.

To start a war, to expand armament and to make war preparations are by themselves shortcuts for American monopoly capitalists to make a quick profit. During World War I (1916-1918), the total average annual profit of U.S. corporations was increased by US\$4 billion as compared with the prewar period from 1912 to 1914. The net profit of American capitalists during World War II totalled approximately US\$60 billion as compared with US\$14 billion during 1931-1938. During the war of aggression against Korea, the profit made by American capitalists jumped from 1949's US\$27.1 billion to US\$42.9 billion in 1951. It can be seen therefore that when mankind suffers from devastation, it is the golden time for American monopoly capitalists to make their fortune. During this time of peace, armament production yields about 25 percent of the total profit made by

American monopoly capitalists.

In the present world today, the socialist camp is the greatest obstacle to the imperialist camp's ambition of world domination. Socialism, being a popular ideal with the people, is a fatal blow to the exploitation system. To realize their ambition of world domination, the American imperialists must fight socialism and Communism. It is not surprising that the spearhead of America's policy of war and aggression is primarily directed at the Soviet Union, China and other socialist states.

The aggressive and war-like nature of American imperialism shows clearly that the U.S. is the "center of reactionary forces in the world" (Moscow Declaration.) American imperialism rallies all reactionary forces of the world around itself and makes itself the most deadly enemy of the people of the world.

A recent foreign policy report published by the Rockefeller Foundation disclosed the real objective of America's foreign policy, saying that the U.S. should "establish a world order to which the U.S. is well accustomed spiritually, economically and politically." For establishing this "order," the U.S. may even resort to war. The report continued that "peace is not the sole objective of foreign policy," and that "a foreign policy devoted solely to the avoidance of war may overlook some constructive aspects upon which the advent of true peace may depend." The report, therefore, advocated that the "U.S. must maintain its military strength at any cost so that she can launch a total or local war whenever it is necessary to use weapons to maintain her own interest." This report reveals clearly the over-all objective and strategy of America's foreign policy.

It is one thing for the U.S. to have an aggressive objective, but it is entirely another thing as to whether she can achieve this objective. Although American imperialists want to eliminate socialism and dominate the whole world, they can never achieve this objective because history is not decided by imperialism but by the people. So long as people all over the world take up the task of maintaining peace, imperialist aggression and war can be stopped.

A very favorable situation is now in existence for the struggle in quest of peace. Brilliant results of economic construction have been achieved and material strength has grown immensely in the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union; socialism and Communism have won

many peoples' hearts. Simultaneous with the steady growth of the socialist camp is the rapid development of national democratic movement in colonies and semi-colonies. Within the imperialist countries, the peace democratic movement is also developing with vigor. These three forces combined form a serious obstacle that prevents the imperialists from starting a war.

On the issue of war or peace, the stand of socialist states is always clear. We enthusiastically support peace and resolutely oppose the imperialists' war of aggression. In striving for peace, we have exerted our efforts without relaxation. Since the end of World War II, the Soviet Union has made many positive proposals on disarmament and the banning of nuclear and atomic tests. Again and again, the Soviet Union, China and other socialist states have voluntarily reduced the number of their troops. Not long ago, the Soviet Union has made a proposal for a general and complete disarmament at the U.N. General Assembly. Toward the solution of important unsettled international problems, the Soviet Union, China and other socialist states have exerted their utmost effort. They have made constructive proposals on the security problem in Europe, Asia and the Pacific area, the German problem, the problem of Western Berlin, the problem of Korea, the problem of Indochina, etc. Last year, the Soviet Union proposed an East-West summit conference to be held in May 1960. The present relaxed world situation is inseparable from the promotion of a peace foreign policy by the Soviet Union, China and the entire socialist camp.

However, we know that we cannot beg for peace, and that peace must be secured through resolute and repeated struggles with the imperialists. Lenin once said: "Anyone who thinks that peace can be had without any effort or that the capitalist class will give us peace on a silver platter as soon as we mention peace, is too naive." (See "Complete works of Lenin," Chinese version, Vol. 26, p. 323.) Historical events that took place during the 15 years since the end of World War II have forcefully proved the validity of Lenin's wise conclusion. After World War II, the imperialist forces headed by the American imperialists have either launched armed aggression or provoked war in Korea, Indo-china, Berlin, Hungary, the Taiwan Strait, the Suez Canal Zone, Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, Iraq, Cuba and other places, but each time the challenge was met squarely and defeated by the socialist camp and the peace-loving peoples all over the world. In these struggles, we frustrated the provocation of the imperialists and upset their timetable for starting

another global war. Thus, peace has been maintained till now since the end of World War II.

Although the international situation is somewhat relaxed and a great change has taken place in the relative strength of the two opposing camps, we must still keep a high degree of vigilance in order to meet any possible emergency incident started by the imperialists.

It is impossible to eliminate war without eliminating class distinction. Lenin pointed out: "Although the proletariat class can always be counted on to oppose war, now or in the future, yet it should be remembered at any minute that only when class distinction is eliminated from society can war be eliminated." (See "Complete Works of Lenin," Chinese version, Vol. 8, p. 240.)

Our mission at the moment is to consolidate the unity of the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union, strengthen ourselves, rally all peace-loving peoples of the world, expose and attack America's scheme of "preparing for war under peace pretensions," and launch a resolute and persistent struggle against the imperialist policy of war and aggression for maintaining a lasting peace. Comrade Mao Tse-tung has instructed us: "It is impossible to persuade the imperialists or plead to their conscience. The only way is to organize a force to struggle with them." (See Mao's article "Abandon Illusions; Prepare for Struggle.") He also said: "To end imperialism, chiefly American imperialism, aggression and oppression is the duty of the people all over the world." (Mao's interview with a correspondent of the Hsinhua News Agency on 1 Oct. 1958.) Only so can we win a true and lasting peace.

AMERICAN IMPERIALISM IS THE SUPPORTER OF GERMAN MILITARISM

[The following is a full translation of an article written by Kuo Ch'ao-ho appearing in Kuo-chi Wen-t'i Yen-chiu, Peiping, No 3, 3 Mar 60, pp 9-15.]

While intensifying their efforts at reviving Japanese militarism in the East, the American imperialists are also quickly reviving West German militarism in the West. In less than 15 years, West Germany is completely recovered under the aegis of the U.S. Not long ago, the U.S. occupation force and West German defense force held a joint military maneuver under the command of U.S. generals in a simulated atomic war, with the Soviet Union and the German Democratic Republic as hypothetical enemies. This is a serious threat to European security and world peace, and shows that America's policy is characterized by "phony peaceful intentions and earnesty in war preparations."

West Germany Is A Mercenary of U.S. Imperialism

In America's postwar strategy for enslaving the people of the world, a chauvinistic West Germany takes a very important position. As early as ten years ago, the late U.S. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles said, "A revived Germany (it should read "a chauvinistic West Germany") can be a great asset to the West. By attracting Eastern Germany into its orbit the West can gain an advanced strategic position in Central Europe which will undermine the Soviet Communist military and political positions in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and other neighboring countries." (See Dulles' "War or Peace," New York edition, 1950, p 156.)

Dulles' attempt to make West Germany an advanced base for attacking socialist countries has the full backing of U.S. military authorities. When Eisenhower took command of the Supreme Headquarters of Allied Powers, Europe [SHAPE], he asserted: "As the geographic center of Europe, West Germany is of great strategic importance to this continent." If West Germany stands on our side, a continuous battlefront will be formed from the Baltic Sea to the Alps mountain. (See NATO annual report, 1951.) Another SHAPE commander General Gruenther said: "To incorporate West German divisions into the present armed forces may enable the NATO nations to operate on the basis of a strategic offensive." (See American "Military Review,"

No. 3, p 68, 22 July 1957.)

This frantic and aggressive goal of U.S. imperialist strategy is in perfect accord with the wishes of West German militarists, namely, revision of the boundary line fixed at the time of the collapse of Nazi Germany, annexation of the German Democratic Republic and attacking the Soviet Union and other neighboring socialist countries. The ambitious Adenauer shouted again and again that "Germany must be strong enough to such an extent as to be able to recover its lost territory." "Unless we can unify Europe, we shall never be able to recover Berlin and the eastern part of Germany," he asserted. Since 1953, the Bonn government has made cartographic revisions of its boundary. On 6 Dec 1953, the Ministry of Interior of the Bonn government openly ordered that all maps which do not show the boundary of the German Empire as of 3 Dec 1937 must be withdrawn from all public organizations. In 1956, the ministry supplemented its order by requiring that the territory to the east of the Oder-Neisse line be marked as "the eastern region of the German Empire temporarily under foreign control." The former Secretary of State of the Bonn government, now Chairman of the Common Market, even shamelessly declared his ambition to establish an integrated Europe all the way to the Ural mountains under the control of West Germany. The West German militarists are only glad to be the vanguard of America's anti-Soviet and anti-Communist movement.

Another clandestine purpose of America's support of West German militarism is to use West Germany as a tool to expand its influence in the capitalist world, especially in England and France. Since the end of World War II, the U.S. has been promoting the so-called West European "integration" movement in which West Germany plays an important role. Her purpose is to use West Germany to fight the Soviet Union and to exploit the conflict between West Germany and other European countries as a means to establish American hegemony in Western Europe, thereby extending its influence into the sphere of influence of such old colonial powers like Britain and France.

West Germany's own interest dictates her to support America's expansion into the capitalist world. The temporary economic prosperity in West Germany has already strengthened its economic position. It wants not only to compete with England and France for economic and political domination in Western Europe but also to rob, in an equal position with other imperialist robbers, the underdeveloped countries in Middle East, Near East and Southeast

Asia where Anglo-Franco influence is dominant.

It can be seen that the U.S. has been using West Germany as an important mercenary in carrying out its policy of war and aggression, and West German militarists are regarding the U.S. as the champion for their desire of revenge and expansion. The temporary mutual benefit draws the two imperialist countries together into a gangsters' alliance.

U.S. is the Supporter of West German Militarism

Since the American imperialists are regarding West Germany as their useful mercenary, they must keep Germany perpetually divided and revive West German militarism as quickly as possible. This is an important element in America's policy of war and aggression during the last 15 years.

After the end of World War II, the American imperialists violated the Potsdam agreement before the ink on the agreement was dry in order to create political, economic and military reasons for reviving West German militarism.

First of all, the American imperialists used all devices to create a political regime as a foundation for the revival of West German militarism. For this purpose they did not hesitate to tear up the Potsdam agreement which called for a united, peaceful, independent and democratic Germany. By unilateral action, the U.S. merged its occupation zone with British occupation zone in Germany in 1947 and changed West German currency in 1948, thus paving the way for a divided Germany. In November 1949, the U.S. created in their occupation zone a Bonn regime separate from the German Democratic Republic.

Secondly, the U.S. imperialists try to preserve and develop West Germany's war economy in order to lay down an economic and social basis for the revival of militarism. For this purpose, the U.S. did not hesitate to violate the Potsdam agreement which banned cartels and called for democracy in West German economy. Those "dead merchants" of Hitler's time connected with the Krupp, Diezen and Manisssmann monopoly capitalist blocs are again in controlling positions in West Germany's national economy.

Thirdly, American imperialism is a close ally of the darkest reactionary force in West Germany. It encourages Nazi, Fascist, militarist and retaliationist propaganda in order to lay down in domestic politics a foundation for the revival of militarism. For this purpose, the U.S. tore to pieces the provisions of the Potsdam agree-

ment in regard to the democratization of political life in West Germany.

Fourthly, the U.S. openly preserves and develops war machineries in West Germany in order to lay down a military foundation for the revival of militarism. For this reason, the U.S. prevents the implementation of the provisions of the Potsdam agreement concerning the demilitarization of West Germany.

Meanwhile, the U.S., in violation of the Potsdam agreement, divided Berlin and put West Berlin under her military occupation, thus making that city a time bomb in the heart of the German Democratic Republic as well as a forward base in the event of an attack on the Soviet Union and other neighboring socialist countries.

What is the objective of all these measures in disregard of the Potsdam agreement? The objective is to incorporate a militarist West Germany into an aggressive military system and to use it as a tool of America's policy of war and aggression.

For its own interest, West German militarism supports America's policy in the hope of strengthening itself under the Western military system. Three months after the establishment of West Germany, Adenauer declared that West German army will be a part of the "European army."

The trampling upon the Potsdam agreement and especially the inauguration of West Germany as a separate country signified that the U.S. plan of incorporating West Germany into the Western military system had already been translated into action. Since 1950, the U.S. has tried to "rationalize" West Germany's rearmament through the European Defense Community Treaty and to make West German troops the nucleus of the aggressive NATO army. But because of the strong opposition of the European people, this plan was finally rejected by France in 1954. The U.S., however, did not give up her intention of incorporating West Germany into the aggressive Western military system. She made West Germany a NATO member through the Paris agreement, which came into effect in May, 1955. From then on, America's intrigue was realized and the pace of West Germany's militarization was quickened.

While incorporating West German troops into the Western military aggressive group, the U.S. imperialists take gradual steps to incorporate West German economy into the military and economic system of the Western nations. Through the Marshall Plan of 1948, the U.S. started "blood transfusion" to West Germany for the development of the latter's military and economic potential, and established control over West German economy.

However, America's ambition far exceeds the control of the military and industrial potential of West Germany alone. In 1953, a European Coal and Steel Community with West Germany as the center was established under the support of the U.S. The actual function of this organization, according to the American plan, is to put all iron and steel produced in the area from Hamm of North Rhine-Westphalia in West Germany down to the northern part of France under U.S. control through Ruhr's ammunition magnets. In the past, Hitler had drawn his important war materials from this area. The U.S. is now the heir to Hitler's war property. The Common Market established in January 1959 is a supplement to the European Coal and Steel Community.

In international politics, the American imperialists try to cover up the revival of militarism in West Germany. The Soviet Union and the German Democratic Republic repeatedly pointed out that the conclusion of a German peace treaty and the end of occupation of Berlin are the two most rational ways to resolve the German problem by peaceful means, and to ease the tense situation in Europe, but the militarists of West Germany stubbornly oppose these proposals because the latter will lead to the relaxation of world situation and obstruct West Germany's arms expansion and war preparations. This stand of West German militarists has the full support of the U.S. Government. Thus the West German militarists are emboldened to trample on all international agreements concerning the German problem. The U.S., on the other hand, uses the intricate relationship of international politics to ensure the militarization of West Germany and, at the same time, uses West Germany to obstruct the implementation of international agreements in order to maintain a tense world situation needed by the U.S.

Source of Danger of A Serious War

The quickened pace of reviving militarism in West Germany has produced serious consequences threatening peace and security in Europe and the whole world. West Germany under the support of U.S. has become a base from where the U.S. will make new wars in Europe.

No matter from which angle of view--military, political and economic, West Germany is a hotbed of serious war crises.

Militarily, the missile-equipped armed forces of the Federal Republic of Germany, which will be adapted to

atomic combat by 1961, have become the hardcore of the NATO aggressive bloc.

In July 1956, a universal conscription system was enforced in West Germany. Up to the end of 1959, West Germany had 240,000 troops in eight divisions, approximately half of the total ground force of the NATO aggressive bloc in Central Europe. During 1960, the German federal defense force will be expanded to 350,000 troops in 12 divisions which will be the main force with which the U.S. may start an aggressive war in Europe. The West German navy has 17 squadrons totalling 22,000 men, with 160 warships and submarines. Its air force has more than 1,000 planes, of which 150 are bombers capable of carrying nuclear bombs. Both the navy and the air force are undergoing rigorous training and expansion. According to official announcements, they will be combat ready by 1963.

In addition, the German militarists, with the assistance of the U.S., have established other armed units under different fancy names not subject to the control of NATO command. These units include the Territorial Defense Guards, the Mobile Police in different states, the Federal Defense Army Reserve Corps, the Technical Auxiliary Unit (or Army Engineering Reserve Corps), Air-raid Ambulance Corp, Military Red Cross etc. In addition, West Germany is now organizing a "native force" of 150,000 men during the peace time so that "under emergency conditions it can grow into a force of several hundred thousand in a few days." (See West German Deutsche Zeitung U. Wirtschaftzeitung.)

More seriously, the U.S. has not only established in West Germany a closely knit network of missile and air-bases but also started equipping West German army with rockets and nuclear weapons. Despite the opposition of the people, the West German Parliament passed a resolution permitting the federal defense force to be equipped with atomic weapons. This was an important step. From then on, for adaptation to atomic warfare, the federal defense force was reorganized with brigade as the basic unit. At the end of 1959, West Germany had two "Honest John" missile battalions, one "Nike-Hercules" missile battalion, and one "Metador" missile unit. According to official information, West Germany has now more than 48 "multiple-purpose" missiles (which can carry both nuclear and ordinary warheads complete with as many launching pads, 288 "Honest John" missiles with 36 launching pads, and a large number of "Nike" missiles with at least 144 launching pads.

West Germany is now manufacturing all kinds of

weapons including rockets, and she has been permitted to make American "Starjet" supersonic fighters and "Rattlesnake" missiles. More seriously, the U.S. is ready to let West Germany manufacture tactic nuclear weapons so that she can concentrate her own efforts on manufacturing intercontinental ballistic missiles. For this purpose, the U.S. is preparing to sign a treaty with West Germany nullifying the agreement which forbids West Germany to make nuclear weapons. In fact, the preparatory work for producing nuclear weapons has been underway for a long time, only awaiting to be legalized and made public. West Germany is known to have five uranium mines with a total deposit of 250 tons. The Farben trust is now building the biggest heavy water plant in West Germany capable of producing 150 tons of heavy water a year, about 83 percent of the annual heavy water output in the U.S.

Politically, for adapting to the need of rearmament and revenge, the Bonn regime has been reorganized as a Fascist organization long time ago. Being the largest Fascist organization, the Bonn regime itself is a Nazi agency kept intact and perpetuated by the American imperialists. According to the British "Reynolds News," 181,202 persons now in West German government agencies had worked in one capacity or another in former Nazi organizations. In judicial agencies alone, 600 judges and procurators are former Nazi elements. More than one-third of the Bonn regime's diplomats are former Nazis. As to West Germany's military officers, from generals down to lieutenants, they are all from Hitler's "National Defense Army." Such Bonn dignitaries as the stinking Defense Minister Joseph Strauss, Interior Minister Dr. Gerhard Schroeder, the so-called Minister for Refugees and Expellees Dr. Oberlaender and others are 100 percent Nazi elements. Oberlaender, former head of the Nazi Party Guards, had participated in the slaughtering of numerous Jews and East Europeans during World War II. Because of the protection of American imperialists, these bloody handed war criminals got away from law and occupy important positions in the Bonn government.

The Bonn regime's militarization program and Fasist policy have aroused the angry opposition of the German people. To suppress people's opposition, the Bonn regime, just like the Hitler regime, adopted suppressive measures against the German Communist Party. By the end of 1945 before the Paris agreement came into effect, the Bonn regime persecuted and outlawed the German Communist Party. From then on, the Free German Youth League, the German-Soviet Friendship Association,

the Democratic German National Front, the German Peace Committee, the Association of the Oppressed People Under Nazism and other people's organizations were outlawed one after another. Recently, the ruling bloc of West Germany, under the encouragement and support of American imperialists, started an anti-Semitic campaign and oppressed all peace and progressive elements, especially those who oppose preparations for an atomic war. At the end of January 1960, the Bonn regime promulgated an "emergency state law" which further deprived people of their basic rights, and empowered the chancellor of West Germany to declare "a state of emergency" in the nation at any time and to use armed force to suppress the rebels. This law in fact gives the government the right to nullify provisions in regard to democratization in the Constitution, and to shift to Fascist methods of control. The promulgation of this law at this time is aimed at suppressing the masses who are violently against atomic armament.

While suppressing people's democratic rights and people's demands for peace, the ruling bloc of West Germany exerts its utmost efforts in creating war frenzy, waging propaganda warfare against the Soviet Union and Communism and stirring up sentiments of revenge and chauvinism. This is so-called ideological preparation for war. Following the example of the U.S., the Bonn regime sets up a so-called "Bureau of Psychological Warfare" under the joint sponsorship of the Ministry of National Defense, Ministry of Interior, "Ministry of All-German Problem" and the Chancellor's Office under the control of this bureau, there are no less than 1,000 secret service agencies, organizations for vengeance, soldiers' organizations, fraternal associations, Fascist organizations and semi-military bodies. Let us use landesverband [fraternal association for natives from a place] as an example to illustrate the reactionary functions of these organizations. A minister of the Bonn regime said: "It is fundamentally wrong if we look upon a fraternal association as an organization for reminiscing the past or preserving our tradition. We think the chief function of landesverband is to recover our eastern territory." In the light of this, it is not difficult to understand why Adenauer, who had once advocated the independence of North Rhine-Westphalia from Germany, is now personally attending every annual meeting of the "Upper Silesia Landesverband" and the "Landesverband for Germans in Sudetenland," and why Dr. Schroeder did not miss a single chance to make war-like speeches at Soldiers' Association meetings.

Economically, the monopoly capitalist class is the pillar of West German militarism which is responsible for the last two world wars, and the U.S. is doing its best to preserve and revive this class. During the decade from 1945 to 1955, the total U.S. "aid" and loans to West Germany amounted to 15 billion Deutsche Marks, of which 75-80 percent were invested in German industry, especially such war industries as electronics, automobile and petroleum. Through capital investment, patent contracts and technical cooperation, the tie between U.S. monopoly capitalists and their counterpart in West Germany is cemented. Up to 1956, the U.S. controlled 50 percent of West Germany's petroleum output and 30 percent of West Germany's automobile output.

It is U.S. support to West German monopoly capitalists that has made the quick revival and development of West German industry possible. During 1958, West Germany's industrial output reached 232 percent of that in 1936; in other words, its 1958 industrial output surpassed that of 1936 by 40 percent. From 1948 to the third quarter of 1959, West Germany's industrial output rose from 4.3 percent to 10 percent of the total industrial output of the capitalist world, and surpassed the industrial output of Britain during that period. Meanwhile, monopoly capital in West Germany is now more concentrated than any time in the history of Germany.

In 1938, there were 5,518 corporations in Germany with a total capital of 18.7 billion Marks but in 1958 there were only 2,530 corporations in West Germany with a total capital of 26.87 billion Deutsche Marks. This shows that the number of corporations was reduced by 50 percent, but the total capital was increased by 43.3 percent. At present, 17 big West German combines have a total capital representing 80 percent of the registered capital in the country. Ten big combines, including Krupp, Volk, Diezen, Haniger and Manissmann, control 95 percent of West Germany's metallurgical industry, 100 percent of iron ore output and 87 percent of coal output. Five big automobile manufacturers including Daimler-Benz, Volks Automobile Company and Ford Motor Company control 89 percent of West Germany's auto industry. The Farben trust, the Siemens combine and the German Universal Electric Company monopolize West Germany's chemical and electrical industries. All these big combines are closely related with the Deutsche Bank, the Dresden Bank and the Commercial Bank.

The collusion between American imperialism and West German monopoly capital is also seen in armament

production. At the early stage of militarization, the expansion of West Germany's monopoly capital had to rely upon foreign supplies. More than 60 percent of the weapons and ammunition needed by West Germany's armed forces were procured abroad (mostly in the U.S.), and almost all of the "essential equipment," including airplanes and guided missiles, were supplied by the U.S. A huge profit is thus made by American monopoly capitalists.

As we have mentioned before, since the U.S. entertains the illusion of catching up with the Soviet Union in defense production by concentrating its efforts on missile development, she wants West Germany to further expand its armament production. At the same time, because of the gradual slow down of postwar economy, West Germany relies heavily on defense orders to keep its industry solvent. At present, West Germany is able to produce 65 percent of the armament it needs.

The quick revival of West German militarism is a direct result of America's implementation of its war-like and aggressive policies. Through the NATO, the U.S. has joined hands with West German militarism in a gangsters' alliance. On the surface, West Germany is America's indispensable ally without whom it would be difficult for the U.S. to start a war. In fact, West Germany is a junior partner because she is no match of the U.S. in either military or economic power. American imperialism, therefore, is still the chief enemy of world peace.

America's grooming of West German militarism is aimed at attacking the Soviet Union, the socialist states in Eastern Europe and annexation of the German Democratic Republic by force. In a world today when the strength of socialism surpasses that of imperialism and the force of peace surpasses that of war, it must be pointed out that West Germany has become a potential battlefield which tends to disturb the status quo within the imperialist camp. History has proved that Hitler did not attack the Soviet Union first, but attacked the Western nations first. After World War I, the U.S., Britain and France were all supporters of Germany. Who can guarantee that America's effort at reviving West German militarism will not boomerang?

West German militarists should know that times have changed and the epoch of Hitler is over. The first German nation led by the proletariat, the German Democratic Republic, is now standing like a lofty monument in the eastern Part of Germany, and the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union is a strong bulwark of

peace. If anybody, be it Konrad Adenauer or his supporter, wants to follow the footsteps of Hitler, he will meet a fate not any better than the Fuehrer.

Comrade Ulbricht wrote to Adenauer on 23 Jan 1960 that "if West Germany does not stop atomic armament, arms expansion and war preparations within a short time, the German Democratic Republic will be compelled to take corresponding measures for self-defense and ask its ally to equip it with guided missiles." The declaration of Warsaw Treaty nations issued on 4 Feb 1960 said: "The combined force of the socialist camp assures that the independence of the German Democratic Republic will not be encroached upon, the Western territory of Poland will never be conquered again and the invulnerability of Czechoslovakian boundary will never be pierced." This is a stern warning to West German militarists and their supporters.

The Chinese people have always been staunch supporters of the German Democratic Republic in the latter's struggle against the revival of the Deutschland and for the peaceful unification of Germany because they themselves experience the menace to peace in Asia caused by America's activities in reviving Japanese militarism. At a time when Japanese and West German militarism may precipitate another war, we should further consolidate the unity of socialist countries. Comrade K'ang Sheng said at a meeting of the Political Consultative Conference of the Warsaw pact nations: "China will regard an attack on any socialist state by any imperialist country or any reactionary force as an attack on China itself."

America's aggressive policy of reviving West German militarism has been condemned by peace-loving peoples all over the world because this policy is isolated and extremely unpopular. If people all over the world intensify their struggle and are ready to deal any potential aggressor a blow twice as severe as the original attack, the war-like and aggressive plan of the U.S. imperialists will be shattered to pieces.

CRITICISM OF CAPITALIST INTERNATIONAL LAW IN REGARD TO THEORIES ON STATE SOVEREIGNTY

[The following is a full translation of the third of a series of articles by Ying T'ao under the general heading "Criticism of Capitalist International Law" appearing in Kuo-chi Wen-t'i Yen-chiu, Peiping, No. 3, 3 Mar 1960, pp 47-52.]

Sovereignty is the supreme power of a state to make independent decisions about its internal and external affairs according to its own will. Once deprived of sovereignty, a nation will no longer be an independent state. In international cooperation and struggle, sovereignty is also a matter of paramount importance. Upholding the principle of "inviolability of sovereignty," the oppressed peoples of the world are launching, as they did in the past, stubborn struggles against imperialism in defense of their sovereignty. The five principles of peaceful coexistence, which reflect the desire of the majority of the peoples of the world, provide that all countries should respect each other's sovereignty. But capitalist international law, dictated by the interest of the capitalist class, vacillates, contradicts itself, and nowadays even openly attempts to bury the principle of "inviolability of sovereignty" to justify imperialist aggression.

I

During the early stage of capitalism, capitalist international jurists had introduced some progressive ideas about sovereignty, saying that sovereignty is "the absolute and perpetual power of a state," supreme within a state and indivisible. They stressed upon "national independence" and "equality of sovereign states" as well as "national sovereignty" and "people's sovereignty." These principles were in perfect accord with the interest of the capitalist class at a time when its controlling position was still not well consolidated and subject to attack and interference by feudalist kingdoms. In international intercourse, these young capitalist countries were frequently victims of high-handed diplomacy. Therefore, they made it known that their sovereignty was "absolute" and "indivisible," and used "independence" and "equality" to stave off feudalist encroachment on their sovereignty. At the same time, they coined such terms as "national sovereignty" and "people's sovereignty" to

nobilize and rally the masses in their fight with feudalist lords who claimed, "I am the state," or "sovereignty belongs to the monarch."

It must be pointed out that the capitalist international jurists at that time were by no means unanimous in their views toward the theory of "indivisibility of sovereignty" and, in fact, debates among them were quite often. Some advocated that sovereignty is not an absolute power, although it is supreme within a state, while others maintained that sovereignty is divisible, saying that "all powers associated with sovereignty need not necessarily be united in one person."

The genesis of the theory of "divisibility of sovereignty" can be attributed to the attainment of various degrees of independence by member states of feudalist empires, the emergence of a distinction between full-sovereign and not-full sovereign states, the change of the United States of America from a confederation to a federal state and the accompanying division of power between the federal government and state governments. These are facts that international law must reckon with.

Evidently, what they said merely touched upon the superficial phenomenon without tackling the real problem. (For instance, although the United States is a federal state, it is still a single sovereign country because the sovereignty of each member state is only apparent rather than real, and has never given rise to the problem of sovereign division between the federation and the state.) However, from this it can be discerned that through recognition of these facts the capitalist class was trying to further liquidate the influence of feudalist empires. Meanwhile, it can be seen that the desire of foreign expansion on the part of some advanced capitalist countries had been faithfully reflected by thoughtful capitalist international jurists. This is one aspect that the capitalist international law tries to deny. Those comparatively backward capitalist countries of course refused to accept the theory of divisibility of sovereignty because of their own interest. All these, therefore, lead to an inevitable controversy in international law. However, this controversy did not blur the basic character of capitalist international law which reflects the will of the capitalist class. On the contrary, it exposes the basic character of capitalist international law even more.

II

The development of capitalism quickly put some young capitalist countries on the road to expansion and foreign aggression. They used all methods to weaken or destroy the sovereignty of other countries, the most commonly used methods being as follows:

(1) Conquer a country by force, put it under colonial control and destroy its sovereignty. Such instances are many in the history of imperialist aggression. Most of the colonies in Asia, Africa and other parts of the world still under the British and French imperialism were conquered in this manner.

(2) Coerce a weak nation to become a vassal state or a protectorate, which may still remain an independent sovereign country in name but actually has no freedom whatsoever to exercise its sovereign power. The reason why the imperialists resorted to this kind of trick is to reduce resistance and facilitate their control over their victims. For instance, before the independence of India and Indonesia, there were many native states in India and many feudalist dukedoms in Indonesia; all of them were called vassal states under the control of Britain and Netherland. During the period between the Sino-Japanese War of 1894 and Japan's formal annexation of Korea in 1910, Korea was called Japan's protectorate.

(3) Use armed aggression to seize a part of the territory of other countries and place it under the nominal control of a puppet regime so as to cover up the imperialists' colonial policy. The so-called Manchukuo set up by Japan in Manchuria after the Mukden incident of 1931 is a typical example.

(4) Establish concessions on the territory of other countries and assume the role of rulers over the concessions, thereby undermining the sovereignty of other countries. In the history of imperialist aggression against China, this method had been used numerous times.

(5) Seek extraterritorial rights and seize special tariff privileges from weak nations. Extraterritoriality destroys the judicial integrity of the victim nation, while special tariff privileges deprive a weak nation of its tariff autonomy--an important weapon of weak nations for self-defense against economic aggression. During the period from the middle of the 18th century to the end of the 19th century, the British, American and French imperialists seized such rights and privileges through the conclusion of unequal treaties with many Oriental countries like China, Korea and Thailand.

In numerous instances, the imperialists obtained

inland water navigation rights and the right of establishing factories in weak nations, making thereby the sovereignty of a weak nation an easy prey of imperialist expansion. In adaptation to this situation and to the need of big powers, the capitalist international law further developed the theory of divisibility of sovereignty and reaffirmed the distinction between full sovereign and not-full sovereign states. Labelled as not-full sovereign states, all protectorates, vassal states and weak nations, robbed by imperialists of special concessions, are not regarded as "complete and normal subjects of international law." (See L. Oppenheim's "International Law," Part I, Volume I, p 105.) In international relations, they can only be dominated by "full sovereign" states, or big capitalist powers.

After World War I, the debate on whether sovereignty is divisible or not receded and the controversy shifted to the following question: "How far sovereignty as it presents itself from the point of view of the internal law of the state, namely, as the highest, underived power and as the exclusive competence to determine its jurisdictional limits, is compatible with the normal function and development of international law and organizations?" (See L. Oppenheim's "International Law," Part I, Volume I, p 108.)

The question under discussion implies two things: One is that capitalism has reached the stage of imperialism which more and more resorts to the practice of damaging, restraining and undermining the sovereignty of weak nations. The other is that the capitalist international jurists were trying to establish a "superior legal order" under which all states are bound in their exercise of sovereign power by the international law written by capitalist scholars and all states are dominated by capitalist-controlled international organizations. It is seen therefore that the capitalist international law conforms 100 percent to the wishes of capitalist Powers and capitalist international jurists are but faithful servants of capitalism seeking legal bases for imperialist aggression.

In order to hoodwink the people, the capitalist class has to put up a camouflage on legal matters. Although the imperialists trample on or undermine the sovereignty of weak nations, they still wish to whitewash their brutal action by such lies as "equality of sovereignty," and "equality of nations" before international law. In the minds of imperialists, "equality" merely means equality between "civilized nations," and equal

opportunity to carve up colonies rather than genuine equality between big and small nations.

The history of imperialist aggression against China is full of examples to explain this point. The imperialist Powers not only wanted to establish their spheres of influence in China, but also wished to carry out their doctrines of "open door," "equal opportunity" and "equal privileges." They had never even thought of treating China in accordance with principles of "equality of nations," or "equality of sovereignty" as if these principles were inapplicable to an oppressed nation like China.

When Hitler was about to start his war of aggression for world conquest, those capitalist international jurists who reflected Hitler's wishes replaced such high-sounding phrases as "equality of sovereignty" and "equality of nations," with "Pan-Germanism" and "superior race," twisting international law to fit Fascist doctrines.

They exaggerated the absurd concept of "absolute sovereignty" to the extreme, saying that sovereign power not only is absolutely indestructible, but also can be wielded at will in international society. They interpreted Nazi Germany's aggression, annexation of weak nations and slaughtering of peace-loving people everywhere as exercising its "absolute sovereignty," permitted by international law. Of course, their interpretation of "absolute sovereignty" did not apply to the sovereignty of the victims of Fascist aggression. Indeed, their theory was but an attempt to negate the sovereignty of other countries.

If we say that capitalist international jurists' emphasis on "divisibility of sovereignty" is aimed at undermining and negating the sovereignty of weak nations and paving the way for imperialist aggression, then the theory of "absolute sovereignty" is introduced to defend imperialist aggression. The purposes of the two are the same.

III

After World War II, the world's center of reactionary forces is shifted to the United States. American imperialists have become leaders of the aggressive bloc. They attempt to deprive other nations of their sovereignty in order to achieve their purpose of dominating and enslaving the people of the world. The capitalist international law which reflects this kind of ambition on the part of the imperialists appears even

more malicious and treacherous. Playing up all theories bent on burying sovereignty as a political concept, the capitalist jurists introduced such slogans as "world state," "world sovereignty" to replace "national sovereignty." In their opinion, "national sovereignty is inseparable from anarchism," "sovereignty is the cause of all wars," "the price of sovereignty is war," and "only a world government can prevent international war."

Using "prevention of international war" as an alibi, the capitalist international law attempts forcible unification of the economic and political organizations of all the states in disregard of the wishes of the people. It claims that "in the next century to come, the rights and obligations of nations will mold the social systems of all states to conform to a basic pattern required by a unified world." Suggesting the establishment of a "united states of the world," the capitalist international law lays down two conditions for the realization of this plan, namely, restraint of national sovereignty and establishment of international sovereignty.

According to the imagination of the capitalist international jurists, "the president of the world government will be given full power which may even possibly make Adolph Hitler envious; he is not only the commander-in-chief of all the armed forces of the world, but also the president and grand justice of the world court." (See "The Basic Principles and Problems of Contemporary International Law--A Collection of Essays on International Law," Part I, published by the Legal Publications Association, Peiping, 1956 edition, p 104.)

From these absurd theories, we can see that the aggressors are trying to hide the real reason of war, namely, war is the fellow traveller of imperialism, and that the aggressors use war to threaten other nations until they give up their sovereignty and become docile slaves. Naturally, the supreme and omnipotent ruler of this "world government" or "world state," who will even arouse Hitler's jealousy, will be an American imperialist. The New York Times of 1 Oct, 1957 declared that "we must give due attention to the idea of a world state because the founding of such a state will give us the right to interfere with the affairs in many places of the world where we have hitherto no right to interfere." By saying so, the American imperialists are putting all the cards on the table.

We should not overlook the other trick being played by the American imperialists, that is, the U.S. lays so much emphasis on human rights in international law,

regards individuals as subjects of international law and proclaims itself as the champion of human rights. People will naturally ask: "Have the beastly butchers who killed so many innocent people with atomic bomb in Japan, with germ warfare in Korea, and oppressed millions of negroes in their own country, really changed their nature and become humane?" No. They merely use human rights as an alibi in an attempt to deprive other nations of their sovereignty.

In the present world situation, the American imperialists are chanting human rights for two reasons: (1) They attempt to use human rights as a weapon to interfere with the domestic affairs of other countries, particularly the socialist countries. (2) In the name of human rights, they give asylum to the so-called "refugees" who are actually reactionary escapees, and use these refugees to conduct activities against their own motherland. The intentions of American imperialists are malicious. In the world today, socialist states are the ones which really respect human rights. The capitalist class, especially the American imperialists who chant human rights all the time, are the ones who not only not respect but also encroach upon human rights.

Like an object and its shadow, American imperialist encroachment upon other nations' sovereignty is inseparable from the capitalist international law which represents the interest of the monopoly capitalist class. Let us first look at how American imperialism brutally destroys the sovereignty of other nations.

(1) Under the camouflage of "mutual defense" and "anti-Communism," the American imperialists have organized many military aggressive blocs. True, these blocs are directed at socialist states, the United States, by virtue of the alliance, obtains control over the manpower and material resources of the members of the bloc. Surrounding the socialist states, the United States has built many military bases thousands of miles away from home. The countries which lease their territory to the United States turn part of their sovereignty to the United States; the latter, in fact, regards these bases as its own territory.

In the law suit of 11 employees of the Wilmilia-Brown Contracting Company (a firm which had done construction work on American airbases in Bermuda) versus the company, the judgment of the U.S. District Court of the Southern District of New York said: "If we take a look at all the agreements concerning American military bases overseas, we cannot but come to the conclusion that over

the territory of these bases, the United States exercises its jurisdiction as fully as it does in Guan, Ku-a-no Islands, Sa-lien-ya, Puerto Rico and the Panama Canal Zone. As everybody knows, these are early American possessions."

(2) Through the so-called "Truman Doctrine," "Marshall Plan" and "Eisenhower Doctrine," the United States uses "economic aid" as a bait to make the recipient countries degenerate to the position of America's vassal states. For example, a recipient country of U.S. aid must agree that U.S. aid materials must be used under U.S. supervision in the way as prescribed by the U.S. Government. The recipient country is required to develop the production of materials needed by the U.S. It must not buy materials from foreign countries other than the United States. American citizens and companies must be given equal privileges as those granted to the citizens and companies of the recipient country for developing the resources of the recipient country. These obligations imposed upon the beneficiaries of U.S. aid, designed only to the satisfaction of the ruling bloc in the United States, trample on and destroy the sovereignty of the recipient countries. Even the U.S. admits that, in the words of American jurist Lan-fan-ssu-t'ai-en, "according to the provisions concerning mutual help and cooperation, what clearly comes under the jurisdiction of a sovereign state seems to be or has already become a matter subject to U.S. advice, instruction or concern." This leads to brutal American intervention in the domestic affairs of other nations.

(3) Prostitute the name of international organization, control the voting machinery of international organization and destroy the sovereignty of other nations. In 1950, the United States invaded Korea and threatened the security of our country in the name of the United Nations. During the four years from 1956 to 1959, the U.N. General Assembly, under the domination of the United States, discussed the so-called "Hungarian problem" and passed resolutions which interfered with the domestic affairs of Hungary. In November 1950, the U.S. compelled the U.N. General Assembly to pass a resolution for the establishment of a "collective measures committee" in an attempt to form a U.N. force at the disposal of U.S. imperialists.

The then U.S. Secretary of State Dean Acheson openly proposed in the U.N. to include the North Atlantic military alliance into the U.N. "collective measures committee." Again in 1954, the U.S. proposed to put the

Southeast Asia Treaty Organization under this U.N. committee in an attempt to put a U.N. cloak over these aggressive alliances. Although the intrigue of American imperialism was frustrated by the opposition of many nations, the U.S. has never given up the idea of establishing a U.S.-controlled aggressive force under the name of "U.N. Force," or "U.N. Force for Peace." In 1957 and 1958, both the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives passed resolutions favoring the formation of a U.N. army. The proposal to form such an armed force was initiated personally by Eisenhower.

The late U.S. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles said at a press conference at that time that "there should be a U.N. force which can be sent to any place in the world where there is a threat of aggression." Dulles' words represented the best admission of America's intention of using the suggested U.N. force to start aggression and destroy the sovereignty of other nations.

(4) Twist and trample on the generally accepted principles of international law, and bind other sovereignty states by unequal treaties. An American jurist by the name of Levens once said: "Although the U.N. Charter provides that the U.N. is founded on the principle of equality between sovereign member states and non-interference in each other's domestic affairs, yet the actual political situation in the world does not observe this strictly formal legal right, namely, sovereignty." (See "The Basic Principles and Problems of Contemporary International Law--A Collection of Essays on International Law," Part I, published by the Legal Publications Association, Peiping, 1956 edition, p 356.)

Dulles once said that the clock cannot be turned back to the time of Yalta and Potsdam agreements. He regarded the NATO and other aggressive alliances as in perfect accord with the principle of regional defense provided in the U.N. Charter. He was actively in favor of strengthening these aggressive alliances in order that the U.S. may interfere with the domestic affairs of other countries through these aggressive alliances.

(5) Use all kinds of alibis to interfere with the domestic affairs of other countries. For instance, America's illegal interference with China's liberation of Taiwan is a conspicuous example. The U.S. persists in arguing that the Chiang Kai-shek clique, rejected and scorned by the Chinese people, represents a sovereign state. A so-called defense treaty has been concluded between the United States and Chiang. Then using the alibi of carrying out treaty obligations, the U.S. sent

troops to Taiwan, preventing the Chinese people from liberating their own territory.

For the purpose of permanent occupation of Taiwan, the U.S. argues that "the legal status of Taiwan is still not settled," and interpreted the Cairo declaration as merely "a statement of intentions." The U.S. calls Chinese people's effort at liberating Taiwan "annexation of territory by force," or "aggression." China is asked to renounce the use of force and agree to putting Taiwan under U.N. trusteeship pending a plebscite. This amounts to asking China to accept America's permanent occupation of Taiwan.

How does the capitalist international law defend or provide legal arguments for their criminal act of destroying other country's sovereignty? They concocted theories such as "split sovereignty," "obsolete sovereignty" and "incomplete sovereignty." They say that sovereignty is an obsolete idea, and every nation should give up its sovereignty. A nation is said to have "split" or "incomplete" sovereignty when part of its territory is under imperialist occupation. All these absurd theories are introduced to cover up imperialist encroachment of the sovereignty of weak nations.

A joint communique issued by Eisenhower and Nobosuke Kishi on 21 June 1957 said: "The U.S. President reaffirms that Japan has incomplete sovereignty over these islands (referring to the Ryukyu and Bonin Islands)." A long time ago, Oppenheim has used many high-sounding words in his book "International Law" to give legal justification to this kind of aggressive imperialist conduct. He wrote: "A state in its normal appearance does possess independence all round, and therefore full sovereignty. Yet there are states in existence which certainly do not possess full sovereignty, and are therefore named not-full sovereign states." (See Oppenheim's "International Law," Part I, Volume I, p 104.) He was trying to use the distinction between "full sovereign states" and "not-full sovereign states" to cover up the criminal aggressive act of imperialists so that people cannot see the true face of the robbers.

In general, as far as sovereignty is concerned, capitalist international law does its best to defend the imperialist practice of enlarging their own sovereign power and curtailing that of other nations. This kind of imperialist intrigue definitely stands no chance of success because the people of all countries, who have realized the importance of national sovereignty, are currently engaged in struggles in defense of their

sovereign rights. Right now, the violent opposition of the Japanese people to the U.S.-Japanese "security" treaty, their defense of Japanese territorial and sovereign integrity and the anti-imperialist struggles launched by people in Asia, Africa and Latin America are cases in point.

The universally accepted international law has proposed the principle of equality, mutual benefit and mutual respect for each other's territorial and sovereign integrity---ideas sharply directed against imperialism. These principles have won the enthusiastic support of the majority of the people and nations of the world and have grown into an ever-increasingly strong force to resist imperialism.

END

THIS PUBLICATION WAS PREPARED UNDER CONTRACT TO THE
UNITED STATES JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE
A FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION ESTABLISHED
TO SERVICE THE TRANSLATION AND RESEARCH NEEDS
OF THE VARIOUS GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS